

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated July 1, 2005, and has canceled claims 1-19 without prejudice and added new claims 20-32. No new matter has been added as the new claims have support in the application as originally filed. Claims 20-32 are pending. Claims 21 and 30-32 are independent claims. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Amendments to Specification

With this paper, a substitute specification, excluding claims, has been submitted in order to more clearly disclose the invention and to correct informalities that are the basis for objections to the specification. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(b), a clean copy of the substitute specification and a marked-up copy of the substitute specification have been submitted, the marked-up copy indicating the matter being added to and deleted from the specification of record. The substitute specification includes no new matter as the additions to the specification of record have support in the specification as originally filed.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification due to informalities. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the term “infra-coded.”

The substitute specification submitted herewith does not recite the term “infra-coded” and it is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the grounds for objection have been overcome. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 6, 13, 17 and 19 due to informalities. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that claim 3 was unclear and confusing due to the phrase “... which is for managing said one or more titles, and in each title” and that claims 6, 13, 17 and 19 recite the term “infra-coded.”

With this paper, claims 3, 6, 13, 17 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is moot and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection. It is respectfully noted that new claims 20-32 do not recite the term “infra-coded.”

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nikaido et al. (“Nikaido” U.S. Patent No. 6,889,001). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

With this paper, claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15 and 17-19 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 20-32 are allowable over the cited reference.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikaido in view of Dinallo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,929,857). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With this paper, claims 4 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 20-32 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikaido in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,917,830). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With this paper, claims 5 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 20-32 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikaido in view of Na et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,504,996). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With this paper, claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is

respectfully submitted that the rejection is moot and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 20-32 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the claims 20-32 of present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: December 1, 2005

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

Enclosure: Clean copy of Substitute Specification
Marked-up copy of Substitute Specification

Customer No. 035884

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211